

REMARKS

Claim 13 has been amended. New claim 14 has been added. Claims 1-14 are currently pending in the application.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,553,507 (Cohen).

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,287,505 (Calvert) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,507 (Cohen), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,014,658 (Pretz).

Cohen is concerned with identifying software faults in a database. According to Cohen, a fault handler identifies a fault, gathers fault parameters such as a fault address, register values, and stack state from registers and forwards the parameters to a server. A fault searcher on the server then looks for the faults in the fault database. See Cohen, column 2, lines 50-58.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Cohen discloses 'a second transmitting step of transmitting, if the case data is not specified in the searching step, new notification data containing the description of the trouble and indicating that the trouble occurred afresh to said maker-sided device, said new notification data being transmitted according to data related to a maker (col. 2, lines 46-67 – col. 3, lines 1-17)' and a step of 'obtaining answer data containing a troubleshooting procedure corresponding to the new notification data from said maker-side device (col. 2, lines 56-67 to col. 3, lines 1-17).'

Cohen, however, discloses that the fault handler 114 forwards fault parameters to the server 119 in step 206 and that the fault searcher 122 looks for the faults in the fault database 116 in step 207. When the fault is not found in the fault database, the server 119 returns a report to the computer 100 (a terminal) indicating that the fault is new in step 210. Otherwise, when the fault and the corresponding solution are found in the fault database, the server returns the solution in step 212. When the fault is found but a solution is not found, the server returns a possible work around to computer 100 in S213. One embodiment deletes the fault application and forwards error parameters to the software vender.

Cohen does not transmit new notification data when the fault (trouble) is not found (specified) in the database and the report is returned to the computer (user terminal). Cohen forwards error parameters to the vender only when the fault is found in the database and the solution is not found. That is, when a new fault occurs, Cohen does not transmit any information

to the vender (maker-sided device). Therefore, Cohen does not disclose the second transmitting step of claim 1.

Further, Cohen does not teach that a solution (answer data) is obtained from the vender (maker-side device). Cohen has no intention of obtaining a solution from the vender (maker). The transmitting of error parameters to the vender is described as an option of the embodiment. Therefore, cohen does not disclose the answer data obtaining step in claim 1. The Examiner's comment, "look for fault in the fault database, if fault is not found, it is determined that the fault is the new fault and forward it to the vender" (page 4, lines 11-12) is incorrect.

Pretz discloses that communication between a user and a third party is either oral or through electronic mail (col. 5, lines 8-9). Further, Pretz describes that a service representative searches a solution by using separate software (col. 6, lines 28-30), it is different from the present invention, which executes series of actions by a program.

Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 14 is patentable over the references, as none of the references, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests, "said trouble component field and said plurality of related component fields identifying programs."

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13, and 14 are patentable over the references, as none of the references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the above-identified features of the present invention. As dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10-12 depend from the independent claims, the dependent claims are patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented for the independent claims.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

1/19/07

By:


Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005

Serial No. 10/058,421

Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501